

REMARKS

Applicants are respectfully aware of the limitations of 37 CFR 1.116 regarding making amendments after final rejection. As permitted under 37 CFR 1.116, claims 16-29 have been cancelled, and clarified versions of the claims, 30-39, which overcome the 112 rejections and place the claims in better form have been submitted.

Therefore, it respectfully requested that the USPTO not automatically assume that the present amendments impermissibly require a new search or impermissibly require further examination.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to read "Example 7" found at pages 69-70 of the specification which is an exemplary embodiment of the claimed "virtual space." Applicants by presenting this example herein are not arguing limitations which are unclaimed but are merely summarily presenting this background information for the Examiner's understanding and to respectfully expedite prosecution. Claimed language is specifically discussed in context below.

In Example 7, Mr. B who is handicapped and unfortunately cannot easily work in real life places his picture on a virtual figure who can work in a computer generated virtual town almost like a video game of sorts. Mr. B's character works at a rate of 100E in this virtual town. Real customers also visit the virtual space as characters to buy things. In this example, Mr. B sells cars to customers. When Mr. B wants to, he can cash in his earned 7500E for real currency or another virtual currency valid in another space (for example another virtual town) by sending his character to visit a virtual bank in his virtual town. The virtual bank sets the claimed "floating exchange rate." Thus, an entire claimed "virtual space" which is like a video game with characters working *for each other to earn income* is created so that people who could not work ordinarily can now work in this virtual town of this embodiment.

In contrast, and as argued in the applicants previous response, the cited Wong et al. reference is a real world only solution for Internet users who need to exchange real money somehow over the Internet in a secure manner. This is not the same as creating the claimed "virtual space" to work in as claimed, i.e., "participants can conduct economical activities *for each*

*other*" as discussed above. Additionally, "*a floating exchange rate*" is specifically claimed herein and in Wong the "fixed monetary value 4" is stated to be fixed and is thus not floating.

Thus, the PSEUDO CASH, disclosed by Wong et al., is not equivalent to the claimed present invention and a floating exchange rate is not disclosed in Wong as claimed herein. (see col 8, lines 54—67). In short, the pseudo cash can never be exchanged as presently claimed for either real currency or the other virtual currency, based on the claimed "*floating exchange rate*," nor can it be acquired as the counter-value *for the economical activities conducted by each of the plurality of participants for each other* as claimed. Thus, the pseudo cash is nothing but secure digital money to use on the Internet in place of regular currency.


Therefore, as all of the claimed limitations are not taught or suggested by the combination of Kitano and Wong as alleged by the USPTO in the Final Rejection, the requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 USC §103(a) has not respectfully been met by the USPTO's rejections as is required (See also MPEP 706.02(j)).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered and allowed. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned for any reason.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Daniel P. Lent  
Registration No. 44,867  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 23413

December 29, 2004